

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

-----oo0oo-----

FAUN O'NEEL, individually and as
Guardian Ad Litem for her
children B.T., A.O., D.O., and
A.T.,

No. 2:21-cv-02403 WBS DB

Plaintiffs,

ORDER RE: BILLS OF COSTS

v.

CITY OF FOLSOM, a public entity;
SPENSER HEICHLINGER, an
individual; MELANIE CATANIO, an
individual; LOU WRIGHT, an
individual; DOE CITY OF FOLSOM
DEFENDANTS, individuals; KERYN
STARKS, an individual; SASHA
SMITH, an individual; COUNTY OF
SACRAMENTO, a public entity; DOE
DCFAS DEFENDANTS, individuals;
and DOES 1 through 10,
inclusive,

Defendants.

-----oo0oo-----

The court granted summary judgment in favor of
defendants County of Sacramento, Sasha Smith, and Keryn Starkes
on April 18, 2024. (Docket No. 110.) Judgment for those

1 defendants was entered on May 17, 2024. (Docket No. 114.)
2 Defendants subsequently submitted two bills of costs: one for the
3 County and Smith (Docket No. 115) and one for Starkes (Docket No.
4 116).

5 The County and Smith claim itemized costs of \$611.85
6 for service fees, \$580 for witness fees, and \$18,386.25 for
7 printed or electronically recorded transcripts necessarily
8 obtained for use in the case, for a total bill of \$19,578.10.
9 (Docket No. 115.)

10 Starkes claims total itemized costs of \$8,522.25 for
11 printed or electronically recorded transcripts necessarily
12 obtained for use in the case. (Docket No. 116.)

13 Plaintiffs have not objected to the bills of costs and
14 the time to do so has passed. See L.R. 292(c). In light of
15 their lack of objection, costs of \$28,1000.35 will be taxed to
16 plaintiffs.

17 Pursuant to Local Rule 292(e), plaintiffs may file a
18 motion for review of the taxing of all or any part of these costs
19 within seven days of the date of this Order. If no such motion
20 is filed, this Order will stand as final.

21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22 Dated: June 20, 2024



23 WILLIAM B. SHUBB
24 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
25
26
27
28